

Attorney Docket No.: C7755(V)  
Serial No.: 10/583,678  
Filed: June 19, 2006  
Confirmation No.: 4499

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The claims have been amended to make clearer that applicants' detergent granules are layered granules which comprise at least two layers: a functional core and an outer layer comprising an encapsulated perfume. Support for this amendment may be found at page 1, lines 30-35.

The amended claims make clearer that in applicants' granules there is a core and there is an outer layer of encapsulated perfume. This is made even clearer by applicants' claim 3, which recites an outer layer additionally includes unencapsulated perfume.

The Examiner continues to reject the claims over Velazquez in view of Weldes and further in view of Walley. Velazquez does teach encapsulated perfume particles. Velazquez also teaches dry mixing the encapsulated perfume particles with granular detergent base. See column 10, lines 45-49 of Velazquez. The Examiner points to column 10, lines 34-40. The Examiner interprets the "desired formulation ingredients" as including perfume. That may well be the case. Applicants' claims, however, recite an outer layer of encapsulated perfume. In the same paragraph cited by the Examiner, in last sentence, Velazquez teaches that the "perfume delivery particles," i.e. encapsulated perfume particles according to Velazquez, are admixed with the detergent composition. Thus, spray-drying refers to unencapsulated perfume. By contrast, in applicants' invention there is an outer layer of encapsulated perfume particles: the perfume is encapsulated then the slurry of the encapsulated perfume is sprayed on the core detergent granules.

The Examiner also pointed to claim 11 of Velazquez. Claim 11 teaches spraying a perfume on the surface of detergent composition and depends from claim 7. Claim 7

Attorney Docket No.: C7755(V)  
Serial No.: 10/583,678  
Filed: June 19, 2006  
Confirmation No.: 4499

depends from claim 4. Claims 4, 7 and 11 have to be read together. When so read, claim 11 recites a composition comprising encapsulated perfume particle, other detergent ingredients, and a perfume sprayed on top of detergent composition. Claim 11 certainly does not teach a discrete outer layer of encapsulated perfume according to applicants' invention.

Weldes teaches a coated detergent, which may include perfume as well. Weldes however does not teach a detergent particle comprising at least two layers with an outer layer of encapsulated perfume.

Walley teaches encapsulated perfume particles, but Walley does not teach producing detergent granules which contain a functional core and an outer layer of encapsulated perfume particles.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the obviousness rejection over Velazquez in view of Weldes and further in view of Walley be reconsidered and withdrawn.

If a telephone conversation would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of the present application, applicants' undersigned attorney kindly requests the Examiner to telephone at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,  
/Rimma Mitelman/

-----  
Rimma Mitelman  
Registration No. 34,396  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

RM/sa  
(201) 894-2671